

REMARKS

This response is filed in response to an Office Action dated August 22, 2005 issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office in connection with the above identified application. Applicant has carefully studied the outstanding Office Action. The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner.

Claims 1-14 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 4, and 10 have been amended. Claims 2-3, 5-9, and 11-14 remain in this application. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

The Telephone Interview

Initially, Applicant wish to thank the Examiner, Allan HOOSAIN for granting and attending the telephone interview, with the Applicants' Representatives, Henry Sinai on November 9, 2005. In the interview, the claims, and especially amendments to the independent claims 1 and 4 were discussed, as was Bartholomew et al. (US Patent No: 6,215,858). Applicant's arguments are presented below.

Claim Rejections

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-7, 9-10, 12 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Bartholomew et al. (US Patent No: 6,215,858).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the remarks that follow.

Claims 1, 4 and 10 have been currently amended.

Independent claim 1 has been amended and discloses a method for forwarding a telephone call which, *inter alia*, includes routing the incoming telephone call to a dedicated server which, after identifying the number being dialed, retrieves at least one email address which is associated with the number being dialed. The voice message is digitized and forwarded as an email message attachment. The dedicated server is also associated with an unified messaging system which is configured to receive voice messages from any one of the telephone signaling protocols associated with PSTN (Public Switched Telephone Network) or PBX (Private Exchange). The method of claim 1 is not limited to a particular signaling

protocol such as SS7 used by PSTN but is also compatible with any protocol including PBX, SIP and PRI, for example.

Bartholomew et al. ('858) describes a method for mailbox to mailbox communication which transfers a voice message from a mailbox in a first (transferring) telephone network to a mailbox in a second (receiving) telephone network.

Bartholomew et al. ('858) neither describes nor suggests a dedicated server which can retrieve an email address associated with the number being dialed. Furthermore, the system described by Bartholomew et al. ('858) is limited to switched communication networks using an Advanced Intelligence Network (AIN), such as PSTN using SS7 protocol.

Similarly, independent claim 4 has been amended and discloses a method for forwarding a telephone call in email message format to a recipient which, *inter alia*, includes the caller dialing a telephone number associated with a dedicated server. The dedicated server retrieves at least one email address which is associated with the telephone number of the recipient.

Bartholomew et al. ('858) neither describes nor suggests a dedicated server which can retrieve an email address associated with particular telephone number.

Independent claim 10 has been amended and discloses a method for forwarding a facsimile message in email message format to a recipient, which, *inter alia*, includes the caller dialing a facsimile number associated with a dedicated server which converts the fax message so that it may be sent as an email message attachment via the Internet. The dedicated server retrieves at least one email address which is associated with the facsimile number of the recipient. The dedicated server is associated with a unified messaging system which is configured to receive voice messages from any one of the telephone signaling protocols associated with PSTN (Public Switched Telephone Network) or PBX (Private Exchange). The method of claim 10 is not limited to a particular signaling protocol such as SS7 used by PSTN but is also compatible with any protocol including PBX, SIP and PRI, for example.

Bartholomew et al. ('858) neither describes nor suggests a dedicated server which retrieves an email address associated with the facsimile number of the recipient.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art cited by the Examiner, that is Bartholomew et al. ('858), does not anticipate Applicant's amended claims 1, 4 and 10.

Since claims 2-3 depend from independent claim 1, claims 5-9 depend from independent claim 1 and claims 11-14 depend from independent claim 10, claims 2-3, 5-9 and 11-14 cannot be anticipated for the reasons described above with respect to claims 1, 4 and 10, respectively.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 2, 5 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartholomew et al. in view of Bobo,II (US 5,675,507).

Claims 8, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bartholomew et al. in view of Hyde-Thomson (US 5,557,659).

Applicants believe this rejection has been overcome in view of the amendments made above and the remarks that follow.

Claim 2 is dependent from independent claim 1, claims 5 and 8 are dependent from independent claim 4 and claim 11 is dependent from independent claim 10.

Independent claims 1, 4 and 10 have been discussed above with respect to Bartholomew et al. ('858) and are relevant here. Independent claims 1, 4 and 10 include limitations that are not taught nor suggested by the either Bobo II ('507) or Hyde-Thomson ('659).

It is well established that obviousness requires a teaching or a suggestion by the relied upon prior art of all the elements of a claim (M.P.E.P. §2142). Without conceding the appropriateness of the combination, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Bartholomew et al. and Bobo II ('507) or the combination of Bartholomew et al. and Hyde-Thomson ('659) do not meet the requirements of an obvious rejection in that neither teaches nor suggests the use of a dedicated server which retrieves an email address associated with a telephone or facsimile number.

Appl. No. 09/830,982
Amdt. dated Nov. 17 2005
Reply to Office action of August 22, 2005


Since claim 2 is dependent from independent claim 1, claims 5 and 8 are dependent from independent claim 4 and claim 11 is dependent from independent claim 10, Applicants believe these claims are not obvious for at least the same reason.

Applicant notes the Examiner's citation of prior art to complete the record.

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are patentable over the art of record and are now in condition for allowance. Prompt notice of allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel Swirsky
Agent for Applicant
Registration No. 45,148

Dated: July 23, 2006

IP-Partnership
Customer No: 35650
PO Box 669
Raanana 43350, Israel
Phone: +972 9741 2768
Fax (US): 571 272 7543
Email: hsinai@ip-partnership.com